DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 053 458 32 EA 003 686

TITLE Alaska Annual Evaluation Report: Title I, ESEA, FY 70.

INSTITUTION Alaska State Dept. of Education, Juneau.

PUB DATE 70

NOTE 34p.

EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29

DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement, Achievement Gains, Community Involvement, *Compensatory Education, Delinquent Rehabilitation, *Disadvantaged Youth, *Federal Programs, Handicapped Students, Inservice Education, Parent Participation, *Program Evaluation, Retarded Children, Standardized Tests, Teacher Aides, Teacher Education, Test Results

IDENTIFIERS Alaska, *Elementary Secondary Education Act Title I, ESEA Title I

ABSTRACT

This evaluation attempts to measure the extent and effectiveness of ESEA Title I programs designed to meet the needs of disadvantaged children and apprizes the public and the legislature of program outcomes. In keeping with USOE requirements for evaluating Title I programs, this document is constructed of (1) responses to USOE probes by questionnaire sequence, (2) applicable supplementary or background information, and (3) available related findings. Data were collected from interviews with selected personnel from the Alaska State Department of Education; reaction reports from teachers, administrators, State ESEA Title I personnel, and university personnel; onsite visitations by Title I staff and university consultants; and evaluation supplement and narrative reports distributed to local educational agency Title I directors and activity directors. (EA)

ED053458

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT
TITLE I, ESEA OF '70
FOR
STATE OF ALASKA

1 A. There are 29 operating LEA's in the State of Alaska.

1 B. There were 25 LEA's eligible and 20 participated in Title I projects.

1) 12 LEA's operated Title I programs during the regular school term only.
2) 2 LEA's operated Title I programs during the summer term only.
3) 6 LEA's operated Title I programs during both the regular term and the summer term.

1 C. There were a total of 38 Title I activites operated by 20 eligible LEA's.

1 D. The unduplicated number of pupils participating in Title I program in Alaska is as follows:

1) 16,265 Enrolled in Public Schools
512 Enrolled in Private Schools
16,777 Grand Total Participants

2. During the fiscal year of 1970 nearly all (85%) of the Title I projects were visited at least once by some member of the office of Federal Programs. These visits were nearly always for more than one purpose only.

The percentage of visits tabulated by the purpose of the visit were as follows: planning 17%, program development 9% on-site evaluation 33%, program operation 30%, and other 5%. The total of these percentages exceeds the percentage (85%) of districts visited as some projects were observed more than once. With only 29 school districts in the State of Alaska, the interaction between Department of Education staff and the local school district personnel is much broader than the foregoing data indicates. Workshops, teacher conventions, drop-in-visits at the State Department of Education, and telephone calls provide an intimate contact and exchange between SEA and LEA personnel that is not possible in the highly populated states.

Visits by SEA staff provided direction in comprehensive planning and in "know-how" for making an assessment of needs in a number of instances. Local districts were assisted in their program development and program operation in 9 instances. On 12 occasions help was provided directly in designing and selecting evaluation instruments and in writing the evaluation report including emphasis on the following in particular: (1) dissemination (2) teacher - teacher aide in-service programs (3) effects of Title I project on change within the school system and in meeting goals and objectives of the activity, and (4) parent and community involvement.

EA 003 686

3 A.	Changes in Procedure	Effect of the Changes
	1. Department of Education Staff was provided training.	1. More consistent and effective review of applications.
	2. In-service Workshops were provided LEA personnel.	2. Improved applications with more pertinent design, data, etc.
	3. New instrument designed for use in SEA evaluation of LEA's evaluation reports.	3. More consistent evaluation of final evaluation reports with "feedback" to LEA for improving future reports.
	4. Increase in the number of SEA staff (professional and supporting) personnel.	4. More time spent in assisting LEA's.
	5. Greater involvement of SEA Instructional Services Consultant in developing and evaluating Title I proposals.	5. Title I application became more consistent with established guidelines.

3 B. The SEA has emphasized through written communications, workshops, and in conferences with LEA personnel the necessity and the wisdom of including non-public school children in Title I activities. This has not been a problem in Alaska as we have only 14 private schools of concern. These 14 schools are located in seven of the 24 school districts. In every instance, where applicable, an opportunity for them to participate has been provided.

3 C. In a number of instances as a result of State and local evaluations, projects (1) were not continued the following term, (2) were not recommended for use in other schools or school systems, (3) were redesigned with changes in goals, implementation, etc., (4) were recommended for inclusion in the regular school program for all children with finances being provided from sources other than Title I, and (5) were continued for subsequent period(s) of time. In two school district this past year represenatives of the State Department assisted in the designing and rewriting of applications.

4 A. Based on test data for seven Title I programs, there is evidence that such programs are having an effect on reading and academic achievement.

1) In a reading improvement project, the California Reading Test, forms W and X, was administered to grades 2 through 6 in November 1969; and grades 1 through 6 in May 1970. The median total reading scores for all grades were either on grade equivalent (as in the case of grades 2 and 4); or above grade equivalent placement (as in the case of grades 1, 3, 5, and 6).

2) Pre-test and post-test scores on the California Reading Test, Forms W and X, showed students in a reading program to have an overall gain in reading comprehension. The California Reading Test has a standard score mean of fifty with a standard deviation of ten. The data collected from these tests indicated that the mean standard score of the project group increased from thirty-five on the pre-test to thiry-eight is a change from the seventh percentile to the twelfth percentile in reading achievement.

In a reading improvement program 62% of the students who were tested at the beginning of the year and the end of the year reached their expectancies. This figure is reached by comparing September 1969 expectancy scores with May comprehension scores on the following tests: high school- Iowa Silent Reading Test; junior high- Gilmore Oral Reading Test; elementary- Gates MacGinitie Reading Survey.

In this same program 57% of the participants who were in the projects for the entire year showed one year's growth in the content areas. The tests used in the high school was the Iowa Silent Reading Test; in the junior high and elementary schools was the Iowa Achievement Tests.

3) In a individualized instruction project student's average growth in reading comprehension for beginning students was .87 grade equivalents and 1.25 in mathematics growth. Twenty-five students who have been in school for more than one year were tested in spelling and the average growth was .76. Language growth for third grade students, as measured by the Metropolitan Achievement Test, was an average gain of 1.16 years growth. In mathematics those students who were given the Primary II test scored .9 as an average.

4) Results of a remedial reading program indicated forty out of forty six second grade students showed significant inprovement in the mechanics of reading as evidenced by pre- and post-testing with the Gray Oral Reading Test. The Students were considered improved in reading if there was a increase of .3 or better in grade level. There were several students that increased their grade level by more than 1 year. In the sixth grade, using the Gray Oral in a pre- and post-testing situation, fifteen of sixteen students tested showed a measurable gain, with the average gain being 1.7 increase in grade level.

Post-test results for students in this same group - in grades 406 using the Dolch Basic Sight Recognition indicated 1% made no gain and 99% made a gain. The post-test recognition of the 95 common nouns for grades 203, indicates that out of the 71 students tested, 100% show significant gains.

Post-test results for word analysis skills indicated 72% made significant gains while 28% made no measurable gain.

5) In another remedial reading program, a pre-test post-test evaluation design using the California Reading Test shows that the overall progress for 81 pupils involved was .61 grade equivalents for vocabulary and .76 for comprehension. Of the group tested, 23 students were raised from below grade level to above and 17 were raised from below to above grade level in comprehension.

6) Benefits from a teacher-aide program indicated that, using the SRA Achievement test, the 1970 first grade achieved an overall grade equivalent of 1.85 compared to the overall grade equivalent for the 1969 first grade of 1.3, an increase of .5 over last year's first grade. Using the same figures for comparison, 1.3, the same class, 1970 second grade, had an overall grade equivalent of 2.27 this year.

The third grade had a grade equivalent of 3.88 this year. This class had a grade equivalent of 2.58 at the end of second grade, and increase of 1.30 during the school year. The 1969 third grade had a grade equivalent of 3.37, or .51 lower than this year's third grade.

7) In another remedial reading program, 90% of the pilot group (40 students) raised their reading level one full year. The Durrell Reading Analysis Instrument was used.

4 B. While most of the Title I programs involve some aspect of reading improvement, the characteristics that seem to be common to most of them are (1) trends toward individualized learning including non-grading, (2) effort in meeting needs of disadvantaged children (3) involvement of teachers in the development of the project, and (4) an attempt to involve parents and community in planning and implementing the activity.

4 C. Present accounting systems do not provide us with information related to the effectiveness of Title I projects to cost. A cost per pupil ration was established for each project and it was our conclusion that the effectiveness of the projects did not appear to be directly related to cost.

5. Title I has been instrumental in establishing a Federal Programs office in the SEA, and in providing additional consultant and supporting staff time to the LEA's. In 1956-66 the full-time equivalent working on Title I, ESEA was 1.90 (.70 FTE professional; 1.20 FTE supporting); in 1966-67 the persons assigned to Title I duties were 4.75 (1.95 FTE professional; 2.80 FTE supporting); 1967-68 the staff expanded to 7.20 (2.35 FTE professional; 4.85 FTE supporting): in 1968-69 the total staff numbered 9.75 (2.30 FTE professional; 7.45 supporting); and in 1969-70 the total staff numbered 9.95 (4.20 FTE professional, 5.75 supporting). While the major changes that have occurred in the staff of SEA are not all attributable to Title I, the combined impact has had a positive effect on the Department. Due to our Department of Education multiple-assignment philosophy and practice, undoubtedly contact with Title I programs have made all SEA consultants more aware of the pressing need to upgrade evaluation practices in all education.

In the larger LEA's the assignement of a staff person(s) to Federal Programs has occurred. There are real indications that practices are more personal and greater attempts are being made to work with the individual child to meet the students' needs. Title I activities have helped teachers change instructional methods, arrangements and goals. Changes have occurred in teaching methods, use of audio-visuals, enrichment of curriculum, use of teacher aides, scheduling practices and curriculum revisions.

While children from non-public school agencies are involved in Title I projects, we are not aware of any changes made in their administrative structure and educational practices as a result of such participation. In fact, due to their smallness it is very doubtful if any changes have occurred, especially in administrative structure.

6 A. There are no State funds per se which are used to augment Title I programs. In a number of instances local school systems supplement Title I monies to achieve more substantial programs. Since the funds spent by local school boards include State foundation aid, there is some State money being used for Title I programs which cannot be identified.

6 B. State-Operated Schools initiated a Teacher Training Program in conjunction with Teacher Corp, C.O.P., and Title I.

Kodiak Island Borough School District and State-Operated School System conducted Title I Boarding Home Projects which are supplemented by Johnson-O'Malley funds. These projects provide opportunities for youngsters to attend hign school which otherwise would be impossible.

A number of school districts operating media centers have used Title II ESEA and Title IIINDEA to supplement Title I monies.

The Type B Lunch Program provided by the State-Operated School System in remote small schools used USDA commodities.

7. In each instance Title I programs have been available to non-public school children. In all, there are 26 non-public schools ranging in enrollment from less than ten to about 260 in the 29 districts in Alaska. The total enrollment in these 26 private and denominational schools is less than 1190 of which 512 (unduplicated count) or about 50 percent participated in Title I programs in FY-70. Of these non-public school students 419 are located in remote areas served by the Alaska State-Operated Rural Schools. These children are nearly 100 percent economically and culturally deprived which probably accounts to a large degree of their high percentage of participation.

Five of the seven districts with non-public schools participated in nine different Title I programs of which seven occurred during the regular year and two in the summer term. No special adjustments in time of occurrence of the public school children, as well as non-public school personnel and communtiy groups were involved in planning the activities in most instances. The main thrust of quality programs involving non-public school children were in remedial reading, instructional media resources, workshops for teachers and an "intergrated program" which included students in physical education, swimming, speech therapy, remedial reading, language arts, special education and hard of hearing classes.

8. A total of five LEA's conducted "teacher aide" programs. Four programs operated involving 96 teacher aides working with 96 professional staff members. In addition 60 teacher aides were employed in the Type B Lunch Program preparing and serving food in 60 State-Operated Rural Schools.

Total student participants for each activity were as follows: 1672, 550, 540 and 157 in programs of a learning nature and about 2,500 in the Type B Lunch project for a grand total of 5,419.

The general pattern of activities of "teacher-teacher aide" inservice programs includes workshop, film strips and narrations, conference meetings and consultant help. Most teacher aides were used in remedial reading programs in assisting the teachers by helping with small groups and individualized instruction, letter recognition, activities with basic sight words, student verbalizing, listening to students read and phonetic practice. In addition, aides were used to considerable extent in libraries or instructional media center and in test administration, scoring and analysis.

Exhibit A presents two of the better training programs in Alaska.

9. The degree of community and parent involvement varies considerably among schools districts of Alaska. This is due primarily to the fact that (1) many of the communities such as those in the State-Operated School System and a number of the local school districts are very sparsely populated, (2) a limited number of professionals in the small school districts all of whom wear several "hats" and (3) some chief school administrators possess more initiative and drive than others.

In the sparsely populated districts most of the communication and involvement of adults is on a direct bases with parents, such as conferences, reports and discussions at PTA meetings, school open house, teacher home visitations, bulletins of pupils and parents and small discussion groups. These same avenues are used by the larger more heavily populated district. but, in addition, other means of involvement are used, also. These include home-school contacts; parent advisory groups; organized community groups; service organizations: Chamber of Commerce; state agencies, such as "State Mental Health Services;" professionals, such as physicians, dentists, nurses, opticians, etc.; college personnel; tours or field trips; City Council; and others.

Exhibit A

A PROPOSAL TO FUND AN AREA WORKSHOP

1. The subject selected for the workshop is "Language Development as Related to Educational Goals". This important area of curriculum development is critical in the area where the workshop is being held as in the section of the Bristol Bay area, a considerable number of children do not speak English until they attend school. Many of the village people do not speak English.

2. The workshop will be held in Dillingham at the Youth Center with some thirty-five teachers and several Teacher Aides in attendance.

3. The workshop will be a two and one-half day affair, Thursday and Friday and Saturday, March 12th. and 13th., and 14th., 1970.

4. This area was selected as a considerable group of teachers could attend at relatively small expense (the villages are very close together) and because of the particularly significant problem of dual language in this area.

5. A. Objectives:

(a) To bring into sharp focus the problem of non-English speaking parents and elementary (especially first grade) school children.

(b) To explore teacher attitudes toward the problem and help them crystalize their thinking about it.

(c) To explore the problem in relation to primary, middle grade, high school and adult groups.

(d) To suggest method, material, and procedure to meet these problems.

B. Expected Outcomes:

(a) It is expected that the workshop participants will develop a clearer picture of the problem of dual language among their students.

(b) The participants will develop a philosophy about the

problem in relation to education.

(c) The participants will identify groups requiring a variety of educational services in relation to the problem.

(d) The participants will become aware of methods, materials and procedures which will help deal with the problem.

6. A copy of the Agenda is attached. An attempt is made here to deliberately involve a number of teachers in the area in order that via direct participation they will achieve greater insight into the task of language development. Others in attendance will develop new insights as they are helped to this end by fellow teachers who have similar teaching assignments and problems. The native Teacher Aides can make a significant contribution to the teachers' greater understanding of the childrens problems. Dr. Troy Sullivan (formerly a bush teacher), reading specialist and professor at the University of Alaska has been secured to assist with the workshop.

7. Completion-type instruments are being used to help participants achieve some insights as well as to stimulate their thinking.

(a) A pre-session evaluative instrument is attached.
(b) A closing-session evaluative instrument is attached.
(c) Attached also is a post-session item to be sent to the participants on or about May 12th., two months after the workshop to find out what carry-over or impact of such a brief meeting has occurred. This third instrument may be amended, depending on developmental trend during the workshop.

8. Budget:

Travel 42 participants @ av. $50.00	$2,100.00
Per Diem 41 participants, 3 days at $21.00	2,583.00
Consultants fee @ $100.00 per day	200.00
Materials	200.00
Payment(@ $25.00 per day)35 substitutes	1,750.00
	$6,833.00

Note: Post session on Saturday was suggested and developed by the Administrator. As this is a 7th. day Adventist Community, none of the teachers can get home on Saturday. They fly Western Alaska owned by 7th Day Adventist interests.

AGENDA FOR WORKSHOP FOR DILLINGHAM AREA

SUBJECT: Language Development as Related to Educational Goals

PLACE: Dillingham, Alaska - Youth Center

DATES: Thursday and Friday, March 12, 13, 1970

9:00 A.M. I. Opening - Introductions

II. Use of Pre-Session Evaluative Instrument

III. Opening Discussion led by Dr. Troy Sullivan

1. What is the problem of dual language?

It it significant?

How do you deal with the problem it raises?

2. What are the major impediments it offers to a traditional language development program?

3. What constitutes a language development program? Give your rationale for each suggestion.

IV. The problems as we see them of children, whose first language is not English, entering first grade.

- Participants - Teacher Aides

LUNCH BREAK

1:00 P.M. V. The program and materials currently used in our villages in the area of language development.

Led by_____

AGENDA FOR WORKSHOP FOR DILLINGHAM AREA

VI. Program and materials in our language arts program in the middle grades.

Led by_____

VII. Program and materials for the language arts program used in high school.

Led by_____

VIII. The Adult Education Program.

Led by_____

END OF FIRST DAY

March 13, 1970

9:00 A.M.

I. The Alaska Reader, it's use, impact and recommendations for the future.

Conducted by_____

II. Presentation of findings based on the Pre-Session Evaluation Instrument.

Dr. Dawe

III. Suggestions regarding materials and procedures for improving programs.

(Hopefully several participants)

Primary

Middle Grades

High School

Adult Education

AGENDA FOR WORKSHOP FOR BILLINGHAM AREA

IV. End of Session Evaluative Instrument

Saturday a.m. March 14

9:00 a.m. I. Special Interest Topics, Suggestions arising from workshops.

II. Special Interest Films.

D O N O T P U T Y O U R N A M E O N T H I S P A P E R

WORKSHOP

Dillingham, Alaska

March 12, 13, 1970

Subject: Language Development as Related to Educational Goals

Please complete the following statements according to <u>your</u> theories, feelings and attitudes:

1. A major problem in the village where I teach is

2. The formal education of most of the people in the village where I teach

3. For the most part, parents of the children

4. The problem of dual language in my village

5. Very few native children

6. The success of present methods of teaching language development

7. Teaching oral communication skills means

8. Teaching listening skills includes

9. To me, the Alaska Reader

10. After finishing eighth grade, most of the children in my village

D O N O T P U T Y O U R N A M E O N T H I S P A P E R

Please complete the following statements according to your theories, feelings and attitudes:

1. A suggested procedure for dealing with social problems in the village

2. Emphasis in Adult Education

3. It is not feasible to involve parents in the school program unless

4. Improvement in common English usage would

5. Our current practice in language development

6. Continued Use of the Alaska Reader

7. Most native children

8. Ideally, a language development program

9. Materials and method for Language Development Program need

10. Personal and Vocational fulfillment for native students

D O N O T S I G N T H I S P A P E R

ANSWER ONLY a. or b. OF ITEMS 1 - 4

Comments relating to Workshop on Language Development held March 12, 13 in Dillingham:

1a. I have not altered my original thinking about dual language with the children I teach. I still feel

or

1b. My feeling about dual language and the children I teach

2a. There's nothing basically wrong with our educational program. It's just

or

2b. It seems to me that our entire approach to education in rural Alaska

3a. The main emphasis in language development needs to be

or

3b. All levels of our program need to be concerned with language development because

4a. I have not utilized suggestions re materials or procedure because I felt

or

4b. The suggestions I was able to implement

SUPPLEMENT ACTIVITY #9

WORK-SHOP #2 - NORTHERN AREA

PROGRAM DESIGN: Teaching Strategies as related to Language Arts and Social Studies

The Language Arts/Social Studies workshop for the northern area, supervised by Margaret Allen, is designed with the purpose of providing teaching techniques and strategies that would assist the classroom teacher to utilize an interdisciplinary approach to the teaching of social studies emphasizing ideas, basic concepts, and methods of inquiry and induction as contrasted with the teaching of unrelated facts and dates through the traditional lock-step method. It is essential that communicative skills be developed since the Language Arts is the vehicle that carries the Social Studies program.

A two day workshop will be held at two locations: Fairbanks (March 5 & 6); and Anchorage (March 12 & 13). The northern area was selected since there are a number of target area schools operating as identified in the basic demographic data submitted in Part I. The Iowa Basic Skills Tests indicates that students are two years plus below grade level in communicative skills, social studies, and comprehension.

The following chart indicates the locations of the workshop, the schools involved, the number of students to be served and the number of teachers that will participate.

ANCHORAGE

SCHOOL	STUDENTS ELEM.	STUDENTS H.S.	STUDENTS TOTAL	TEACHERS ELEM.	TEACHERS H.S.	TEACHERS TOTAL
Alcantra		30	30		4	4
Anderson	78		78	5		5
Brown's Court	42		42	2		2
Cantwell	18		18	1		1
Ft. Yukon		46	46		7	7
Healy	39		39	2		2
Healy Sust.Hi.		20	20		2	2
Nikolai	27		27	2		2
Nulato	17	23	40	1	2	3
Suntrana	42		42	2		2
Tanana	25	36	61	2	6	8
TOTAL	288	155	443	17	21	38

FAIRBANKS

SCHOOL	STUDENTS ELEM.	H.S.	TOTAL	TEACHERS ELEM.	H.S.	TOTAL
Allakaket	48		48	2		2
Ambler	46		46	3		3
Anaktuvuk Pass	37		37	2		2
Chalkyitsik	39		39	2		2
Circle	15		15	1		1
Ft. Yukon	135		135	8		8
Galena	120		120	6		6
Hughes	36		36	2		2
Huslia	46		46	3		3
Kaltag	68		68	4		4
Kobuk	18		18	1		1
Koyukok	36		36	2		2
Manley Hot Springs	13		13	1		1
Minto	48		48	2		2
Nulato	85		85	5		5
Ruby	38		38	2		2
Stevens Village	23		23	1		1
Tanana	75		75	4		4
Teller	53		53	4		4
TOTAL:	979	-0-	979	55	-0-	55

In addition, two consultants from the Department of Education, Division of Instructional Services, namely; the Social Studies Consultant and the Language Arts Consultant, will conduct the workshop activities of teaching strategies conducive to effective teaching competencies as related to social studies and communicative skills.

Three teaching strategies will be emphasized. They are:

1. Information-Giving Strategy
2. Inquiry Strategy
3. Problem-Solving Strategy

INFORMATION-GIVING: 1

INFORMATION-GIVING STRATEGY

Roles: How do the people involved operate?

Teacher:
1. Contains authoritative information.
2. Decided the boundaries of the area of information to be learned.
3. Decides specific behavioral objectives for learners.
4. Takes and maintains initiative
5. Sets pace of learning situation.
6. Communicates information in logical manner.
7. Uses visual, written, or aural information in a supplementary way.
8. Evaluates learners to determine accuracy of recall.

Student:
1. Decides to receive and contain new information.
2. Provides a logical structure of previous experience to receive and organize the new information.
3. Plans to receive visual, written, aural, or oral communications.
4. Makes himself aware of the objective of the teacher to facilitate future evaluation.
5. Keeps attention within boundaries set by teacher.
6. Records information for future reference.
7. Moves at teacher's pace.
8. Verifies uncertainties through questions at end of presentation.
9. Reproduces information on demand of teacher.

Goals: What operation behavior is expected in the student?

1. Information is to be accurately and permanently transmitted.
2. Information is to be stored logically for future use.
3. Skills of cognition and memory are to be developed in process.
4. Student will become authoritative container of information.

Rules: What are the legal means of sending and receiving information?

1. Teacher determines time, place, sequence.
2. Teacher and student: no digressions.
3. Student signals teacher when information is received.
4. Teacher talks, students listen. Teacher sends, students receive.
5. A time limit is imposed, at the end of which evaluation is made.

Ritual: What patterns of action are standard?

1. Time: Teacher budgets time to include presentation, verification, practice, evaluation. Exams, deadlines.
2. Hands are raised to indicate need for verification.
3. Space: Groups sit as individuals facing source of information.

4. People take turns to talk.
5. Teacher comments after each pupil speaks.
6. Objective testing.

Language: What operational language is characteristic?

Teacher: "These are the things you will need to know"
"This is the way in which..."
"Tomorrow there will be a test..."
"Good, you have them all right..."
"No, this would be a more accurate answer..."
"The correct order is..."
"Are there any questions about what I've said?"
"Please make notes about the following..."
"The next thing we will need to know is..."
"Right!" "Good!" "OK"

Student: "What did you mean when you said..."
"Is this the right order?"
"You said three things; I have only two..."
"When do you want these in...?"
"How many do we have to know in order to pass?"
"Could you repeat that please?"
"Where could I find more information about...?"

Values: How is information-giving evaluated by teacher and student?

1. Presentation:

Concise
Logical
Structured
Sequenced
Well difined
Objectives obvious to student
Means of evaluation obvious at outset
Fits within time slot
Closure as planned

2. Reception of information
Simple
Clear
Related
Objectives clear

3. General

Knowing is the greatest good. A good student is a student with much information.
Development of memory skill under time pressure
Accuracy of recall
Logic of information makes it easy to internalize
Logical knowledge structures assumed in student
Closure a priority (We've covered that subject!)
Speed is valued
Validity of information is assured.

Operational levels related to this teaching strategy are the levels of cognition: to know is a logical order. Memory: to recall and use knowledge in a logical way.

Uses of the strategy are appropriate in:

Giving directions
Explaining a process
Teaching a technique
Developing a rich base
of information

INQUIRY STRATEGY

Roles: How do the people involved operate?

Teacher: Is the chief inquirer
Sets the scene
Creates a situation
Elicits questions
Diagnoses pupil responses
Guides learning through directions based on the diagnoses.

Student: Is a co-inquirer with the teacher
Responds to the teacher with questions, now answers
Forms hypotheses
Challenges other students' hypotheses with questions
Refines questions
Brainstorms to find new approaches to the situation
Evaluates for himself in terms of the rationale related; to this hypothesis.

Goals: What operation behavior is expected in the student?

Students produce increasingly refined questions related to the data presented.
Students produce unique approaches to the problem.
Students develop thinking skills related to divergent, convergent, and evaluative behavior.

Rules: What are the legal means of sending communications?

All student questions are valid
No judging
Start out open
Discussion pursues implications of the questions
Teacher is permitted to help refine questions by counter-questioning.

Language: What operational language is characteristic?

Teacher: "Why?" "Will it work?" "What else...?"
"I wonder if...?" "If____, then_____?"

Student: "You could probably..."
"I wonder if..."

Values: How is information-dialogue and questioning evaluated?

Enjoyment of the process
Enjoyment of increasing skills of observation and thought
Pragmatic: "Will the hypothesis work?"
Increasing independence in the student to apply inquiry to new situations.

PROBLEM-SOLVING STRATEGY

Roles: What behavior is expected of teacher and student?

Teacher: Presents situation
Provides information describing a problem
Confronts students with problem which motivates them to solve it
Translates problem into student experience
Teacher problem-solving process
Provides climate for discussions
Evaluates in terms of livability of solutions

Student: Takes initiative in solving problems
Knows that process of problem solving is the learning
To apply previous experience to definition and solution of problem
To analyze elements of the problem
To develop skill at the problem solving process
To evaluate proposes solutions in terms of given criteria
To take initiative in proposing solutions
To discuss recalled information
To employ critical and analytical thinking
To interact with others in pursuing elements of problem

Goals: What operation behavior is expected in the student?

What are the teacher's and student's objectives in this type lesson
To develop skills at attacking problems
To develop skill at defining the problem
To learn the process of problem solving in its divergent and convergent and evaluative thinking aspects
To find a satisfactory solution to the problem

Rules: What are the legal means of sending and receiving information?

Students respond to each others ideas.
Problem solving process is the authority--discipline factor
Discussion must stay within limits set by conditions of problem

Ritual: What patterns of action are standard?

Teacher establishes seating arrangements for informal discussions
No hands are raised; people interject comment as appropriate

Language: What operational language is characteristic?

"How does this fact relate to the problem?"
"Tell me some of your reasoning behind that statement"
"What else could be operating here?"
"Interesting! What might be the outcome?"

Values: How is information-giving evaluated by teacher and student?

Is the solution liveable?
Does it meet all the criteria for a good solution?
Is the solution an expression of the highest level of thinking the student incapable of at his level of maturity.
Does the solution involve creative, unique approaches?
Is the solution a logical one in view of the terms of the problem?

Operational levels related to this teaching strategy are the levels of cognition: to know is a logical order; memory: to recall and use knowledge in a logical way; divergent thinking: ability to generate unique solutions; convergent thinking: ability to apply logic to the problem to derive a solution; evaluative thinking: ability to evaluate proposed solutions in terms of practicality, appropriateness, and liveability.

LEVELS OF COGNITION

The following is an example of the Cognitive levels:

1. KNOWLEDGE - (Recall)

   a. Facts - "When did Columbus discover America?"

   b. Trends - "What were the Spaniards of the 1400's doing which made a big difference in history?"

   c. Methodology - "How did Columbus prove that the world was round?"

2. COMPREHENSION - (Grasp the meaning)

   a. Translation - "We know Columbus was a sailor and an explorer. How would you describe him?"

   b. Interpretation - "What did Columbus mean when he claimed he could reach the East by traveling West?"

   c. Extrapolation - (new situations) "What appears to be the most direct route from Spain to the West Indies?"

3. APPLICATION - (new situations or already familiar situations with new elements)

   "How could you describe the route that Columbus sailed if he were to take the most direct route from Spain to the West Indies?"

4. ANALYSIS - (Relationships among the parts)
   "What conditions during the time of Columbus made it possible for him to explore and discover?"

5. SYNTHESIS - (Draw together elements into new patterns)
   "Imagine you are one of the crew on board the Pinta. Write a story of the experiences you had during the voyage."

6. EVALUATION - (Judgements about value)

   "Write a paper which you tell what Columbus knew in his day about the world, then tell what we know about our world today."

OBJECTIVE:

The objective in presenting the above teaching strategies as related to an interdisciplinary approach to social studies and the development of communicative skills is:

To improve the quality of teaching disadvantaged children.

It is anticipated that the teachers will carry back into the classroom teaching techniques that will result in specific improved competencies in the following areas:

1. Classroom organization
2. Class control
3. Motivation (stimulate thought, interest and efforts)
4. Skill in discussion techniques
5. Skill in lecture-discussion technique
6. Skill in individual instruction
7. Skill in group instruction
8. Skill in developing thinking process
9. Promotion of student participation
10. Skill in measuring and evaluating achievement
11. Composition skills
12. Adolescent literature
13. Leadership and class morale
14. Slow learner techniques
15. Academically talented techniques
16. Creative planning
17. Knowledge of materials of instruction
18. Pupil-teacher planning

EVALUATION:

The instructional supervisor for the Northern Area will evaluate each teacher in their classroom setting utilizing the following instruments:

1. Principals of Learning (See attachment #1)
2. Method of Participation (See attachment #2)
3. Teacher-Learner Interaction (See attachment #3)
4. Frequency Response (See attachment #4)

In addition the classroom teacher will answer the CHECK YOURSELF SHEET - Are Your Pupils Learning. (See attachment #5)

Based on these instruments, a composite report will be made by the instructional supervisor for the northern area and submitted to the Director, State Operated Schools.

BUDGET:

88 Teachers	@ $ 21.00/day for 3 days (63)	$ 5544.00
2 Consultants	@ 21.00/day for 6 days (126)	252.00
1 Supervisor	@ 21.00/day for 4 days (84)	84.00
		$ 5880.00

Travel to Anchorage:

54 Teachers	2295.25
2 Consultants	220.00
	$ 2515.25

Travel to Fairbanks:

	(Charter	1000.00)
54 Teachers		4126.00
2 Consultants		360.00
1 Supervisor		70.00
		$ 4556.00

Per Diem	3880.00
Travel - Anchorage	2515.25
Travel - Fairbanks	4556.00
TOTAL:	$12951.25

ATTACHMENT # 1

PRINCIPLES OF LEARNING

Directions: Do you see the following principles of learning evident?
Make a check in the appropriate column.

	YES	NO	AT TIMES	UNCERTAIN
1. Is the subject relevant?	___	___	_____	_____
a. Age Level	___	___	_____	_____
b. Content	___	___	_____	_____
2. Does the teacher motivate?	___	___	_____	_____
3. Do the children appear interested?	___	___	_____	_____
4. Is repetition evident?	___	___	_____	_____
5. Is there evidence that the children or child understand concepts or skills being taught?	___	___	_____	_____
a.. Child	___	___	_____	_____
b. Children	___	___	_____	_____
6. Is there evidence that the children are succeeding in their task (s)?	___	___	_____	_____
7. Are the children involved?	___	___	_____	_____

ATTACHMENT #2

METHOD OF PARTICIPATION

Directions: Check the method(s) of participation which has been used for this lesson.

	Whole Class	Small Groups	Individual
1. Listening, Lecturing looking, etc.	_____	_____	_____
2. Practicing, oral dril, trying out	_____	_____	_____
3. Being tested, quizzed.	_____	_____	_____
4. Game, contest, competing	_____	_____	_____
5. Discussion	_____	_____	_____
6. Reading, studying	_____	_____	_____
7. Writing	_____	_____	_____
8. Creating and making	_____	_____	_____
9. Drill	_____	_____	_____
10. Problem Solving	_____	_____	_____

Comment:

ATTACHMENT #3

TEACHER-LEARNER INTERACTION

Directions: Read carefully each category. Be sure you understand them. Make a check about every 5 seconds next to the most appropriate influence.

DIRECT INFLUENCE:

1. Lecturing: Gives facts or opinions about content or procedures; expresses his own ideas.

2. Giving Directions: Directs, commands, or orders with the intent that pupils comply.

3. Criticizing: Criticizes or rebukes; states why he is doing what he is doing: refers extensively to himself.

INDIRECT INFLUENCE:

1. Accepts Feelings: Accepts the feelings of the pupils in a non-threatening manner. Feelings may be positive or negative.

2. Praises or encourages: Jokes that release tension (but not at the expense of another pupil.) Nodding head and saying "um-hm" or "go on" are included.

3. Accepts or Uses Ideas of Pupil: Clarifies or developes ideas suggested by a pupil.

4. Asks Questions: Asks a question about content or procedure with the intent that a pupil answers.

DIRECT INFLUENCE -

1. Lecturing
2. Giving Directions
3. Criticizing

INDIRECT INFLUENCE -

1. Accepts Feelings
2. Praises or Encourages
3. Uses pupil's ideas
4. Asks Questions

ATTACHMENT #4

FREQUENCY RESPONSE

Directions: The class is to be divided into thirds, Groups A, B, and C.

Group A: Put a mark by Teacher every time the teacher talks. Put a mark by S every time a student talks.

Teacher -

Student -

Group B: Try to remember the faces. Put a mark down each time that a student responds. (Sketch a seating arrangement if it helps.)

Student 1-
Student 2-
Student 3-
Student 4-
Student 5-
Student 6-
Student 7-
Student 8-
Student 9-
Student 10-

Group C: Take careful note of when the children talk and when the teacher talks. If the conversation goes from teacher to child and back to the teacher, you would put T-C-T. If it goes from Teacher to child to another child, you would put T-C-C. The results would look something like this: T-C-T-C-C-T.

Discussion Questions:

Is the teacher monopolizing the discussion?
Are a few children answering all of the questions?
Did the conversation usually return to the teacher before another child answered?
What suggestions do you have on this type of teacher-pupil interaction.

ATTACHMENT # 5

CHECK YOURSELF

Are your pupils learning??

Do your pupils know the objectives?

Do your pupils have a stake in the outcomes?

Do your pupils know what progress they are making?

Do you use student interest/motivation to bridge into the lesson?

Do you move from the known to the unknown?

Do you provide learning experiences based upon student experience?

Do you consider individual differences among students?

Do you help to tie knowledge together through summarization or other activities?

Do you develop your assignments from the lesson?

Is your lesson plan balance suitable for each group?

It is unlikely that you lessons will contain each of these factors every day. However, the closer you come to achieving these criteria, the more your students will learn.